DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 453 098 SO 032 634

AUTHOR	Clyne, Fiona; Marginson, Simon; Woock, Roger
TITLE	International Education in Australian Universities: Concepts and Definitions.
PUB DATE	2000-03-11
NOTE	21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Comparative and International Education Society (San Antonio, TX, March 7-12, 2000).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Cultural Context; Discourse Analysis; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *International Education; *Universities
IDENTIFIERS	*Australia; Empirical Research; *Globalization; Organizational Culture; Political Implications; Theoretical Orientation

ABSTRACT

This paper grew out of the research study "Mapping the Internationalization of Higher Education," a 1998-2000 Australian Research Council-funded project. The project's objectives included: documenting the practices of international education in Australian universities; analyzing the cultural, political, and economic assumptions on which they are based, and the discursive-practical relations between these disciplinary "vectors"; exploring the ways in which the concept of internationalization is articulated in Australian universities, and evaluating the arguments put forward to justify its importance and implement its strategies; investigating the manner in which the practices of international education reflect and contribute to contemporary changes in the organizational culture of Australian universities; and theorizing the ways in which organizational practices of international education in Australian universities, and the global positioning of universities, both express and are responsive to the broader processes of globalization. The main empirical research consists of case studies of individual Australian universities, using interviews and the analysis of documents to explore factors influencing policy assumptions, organizational practices, and the intersection between the organizational and educational domains in international education. The paper identifies three discursive domains in relation to the terms "globalization" and "internationalization" in international education: hegemonic ideology, academic critique, and lived experience in universities. Addresses strategic-political implications arising from the contrasting definitions of "internationalization" and "globalization" among the three domains. Contains 18 references. (BT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 453 098

Conference of the Comparative and International Education Society

San Antonio, Texas, 7-12 March 2000

9 am, Saturday 11 March

International education in Australian universities: concepts and definitions

Fiona Clyne, Simon Marginson and Roger Woock

SO 032 634

Simon Marginson

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Monash Centre for Research in International Education
Monash University, Clayton Vic 3168 AUSTRALIA
61-3-99059194 (phone) 61-3-99059197 (fax)
simon.marginson@education.monash.edu.au

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. Introduction

1.1 The research project

This paper arises from the research study 'Mapping the Internationalisation of Higher Education', a 1998-2000 Australian Research Council (ARC) funded project.[1] The objectives of the project include:

- documenting the various practices of international education in Australian universities,
- analysis of the cultural, political and economic assumptions on which they are based, and the discursive-practical relations between these disciplinary 'vectors';
- exploring the various ways in which the concept of internationalisation is articulated in Australian universities, and evaluating the arguments put forward to justify its importance, and implement its strategies;
- investigating the manner in which the practices of international education reflect and contribute to contemporary changes in the organisational culture of Australian universities (Marginson and Considine 2000);
- theorising the ways in which organisational practices of international education in Australian universities, and the global positioning of universities, both express and are responsive to the broader processes of globalisation.

The main part of the empirical research consists of case studies of individual Australian universities, using interviews and the analysis of documents to explore the factors influencing policy assumptions, organisational practices and the intersection between the organisational and educational domains in international education. This includes study of the discursive 'noises' made by son campuses, as discussed in this paper.

So far case studies have included the University of Canberra, the Australian National University (five specific case studies), Wollongong University in NSW and Deakin

[1] The two chief investigators are Professor Fazal Rizvi, Pro Vice Chancellor (International) at the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (RMIT) University, and Professor Simon Marginson, Director of the Monash Centre for Research in International Education (MCRIE). Fiona Clyne and Roger R Woock are consultants to the project and hold honorary appointments as research fellows in MCRIE.

University in Victoria, and it is planned to visit two or three more universities in 2000. At the Australian National University a general institutional case study was followed by four further studies of parts of the institution with a close involvement in international education: the School of Arts, the National Centre for Development Studies, the Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, and the Managing Business in Asia program.

While all Australian universities evoke internationalisation as central to their mission, the institutions in this study were chosen to ensure diversity of institutional type in relation to the location of the university within the national system of higher education. Marginson (1999) discerns five distinct groupings of institutions in Australia, varying by status and resources. These complex factors intersect with others that are simpler to identify, such as geographic location of the university, its size and scope, and its research strength. The selection of cases also took into account the history of involvement in international education, the content of that involvement, and the size, scope and intensity of international education activities within the different Australian institutions.

As of early 2000, interviews had been conducted with more than 70 people, including Vice-Chancellors (the equivalent of American University Presidents), Deans, Heads of Department/School, staff with responsibilities for the international education area, located in both international offices (marketing, student servicing, etc.) and the discipline based academic faculties, academic staff from outside the area but with a view to put, international students and Australian students. Interviews were usually 45-90 minutes long.

1.2 International education

The classic definition of 'international education' refers to education that takes place when students cross borders, whether physically or by distance education, in order to enrol. It is the education of foreign students in a national setting. However, another definition of international education is also in use. Here, international education is held to include a broad range of educational activities that cross national borders, such as staff and student exchange and even research collaboration. More broadly still, it can be extended to take in the effects of international links and sensibilities on curricula, staff development and the

organisational environment (OECD 1998); and also instances where institutions cross borders rather than the students. For example, three Australian universities have opened campuses in Malaysia. In this pthe project from which it is derived, the broadest definition is used, encompassing all of the instances where there are inter-national relations in Australian higher education.

Notwithstanding this, by far the largest and in institutional terms the most important part of international education Australia consists of courses for foreign undergraduate and postgraduate students. In 1999 Australia enrolled 83,047 international students, nearly all paying full-cost fees and three quarters educated on-shore in Australia (DETYA 1999). Australia is the third largest provider of international education after the USA and the UK. International education is more explicitly and thoroughly commercial in character in Australia than in the United States and some other countries (Slaughter and Leslie 1997; Marginson 2000; Marginson and Considine 2000) and as such, is a field of inter-university competition as well as collaboration. Income from international education plays a crucial role in university budgets, providing more than 8 per cent of income overall and in one large institution almost 25 per cent (DETYA 1999).

The commercial character of much of Australian international education shapes the field, as the interview data in this paper show. It also creates potential methodological difficulties in collating data on current activities, for example marketing strategies. It is probable that in every university some of the interviewees are at least partly inhibited. Such inhibitions are more likely to be expressed through self-censorship, than through an outright refusal to answer particular questions. In other words, it is likely that unstated commercial-in-confidence restrictions are in place (though by its nature, such a 'negative' factor cannot be turned into a 'positive' accessible to empirical measurement).

Those working on the project have been careful to observe any designated restrictions on documentary materials or on comments made in interview. It is fair to say that to this point commercial restrictions have not been a major problem. Notwithstanding the commercial sensitivities most interview subjects have been more forthcoming was expected at the start of the project. Perhaps the major exception to this statement, fortunately the only one, is that one major university provider of international education, the University of New

South Wales, refused to take part in a project case study. Fortunately this is the only instance, in this project, of a University refusing to allow itself to be researched.

1.3 The paper

In Australia, the dominant discourse on the internationalisation of universities is the neo-liberal discourse. This frames contemporary Australian policy making and university management. It is less powerful in pedagogies and student servicing, but, increasingly, these activities take place on a ground shaped by corporate management.

In this discourse, globalisation, education policy and management, and international education, are joined together in a single normative circle. Globalisation in education is seen as desirable, and international education as one of its manifestations. Depending on the scope of their authority, the role of manager-leaders is to 'internationalise' their universities, faculties or schools/ departments. Indeed, one performance test of managers is how quickly 'internationalisation' is taking place. All too often, 'internationalisation' is measured by the number of fee-paying international students. National government likes hyper-commercialism because of its power to motivate. In the market, the drive for revenue translates an external policy impulse into an inner institutional force. 'Internationalisation' thus becomes the work of autonomous agents working in their own interests.

The assumptions at the root of this neo-liberal 'virtuous circle' are unproven. The research project started with the hypotheses that:

- in Australian universities the nature of 'globalisation' is untheorised;
- the alleged link between globalisation and international education is both untheorised and is unsupported by evidence
- far from being a unitary practice (let alone a unitary commercial practice feeding into a global market), international education is a heterogeneity of sometimes contradictory practices. There are significant - and again, under-theorised and unexamined - tensions between international education as commercial services, and international education as (1) pedagogical/ pastoral practices, and (2) exchange and collaboration.

In the case studies, one way in which these hypotheses were tested was by asking interview subjects about their understandings of 'globalisation' and 'internationalisation', and the relationship between them. In this paper we select from the answers to these questions, and relevant answers to some subsequent questions, using data gathered at the Universities of Canberra and Wollongong, and the five different studies conducted at the Australian National University.

In turn, these data enable another reflection. The terms 'globalisation' (especially) and 'internationalisation' are the subject of academic/ intellectual discussion in social and cultural theory. In the paper we contrast the academic handling of these terms, with on one hand the response of interview subjects, on the other the dominant neo-liberal discourse. There is a vast literature in this area, and we will touch but a few strands. Our intention is not to provide an exhaustive summary of that discussion but to draw attention to the contrast between what theorists are saying, and what people in universities are saying.

Thus we have identified three discursice domains in relation to the terms 'globalisation' and 'internationalisation' in international education. These domains are hegemonic ideology, academic critique, and lived experience in universities. In the conclusion of the paper we point to what we see as certain strategic-political implications arising from the contrasting definitions of 'internationalisation' and 'globalisation' in the three domains.

2. Theorisations of 'internationalisation' and 'globalisation'

2.1 Internationalisation

The literature on 'internationalisation' includes both descriptive and normative strands. In the descriptive use of the term, 'international' means, as it suggests, relations between nations. In that sense 'international' relations have existed as long as nations. Compared to the term 'globalisation', 'international' is relatively straightforward. It may refer to either bi-lateral or multi-lateral relationships. 'International' relations between two or more nations do not presuppose any change in the character of either the nation-state in general, or of the particular nations involved (except that it implies at least some openness or willingness to

relate between nations). Thus on one hand, an 'international' education might consist of offering the same 'national' curriculum to foreign students: the other, it may involve overhauling the curriculum completely in order to render it bi-lingual and bi-cultural.

The normative use of the term is 'internationalism'. This is an evangelical discourse promoting international solidarity. Thus for example Waterman (1993) argues that the old socialist-proletarian internationalism has given way to practices of solidarity on ecology, peace, gender, human rights, sexuality, indigenous self-determination, and has extended beyond Eurocentrism, though solidarity between labour movements is not excluded. He promotes 'internationalism' as a political counter to a high capitalist 'globalism'.

2.2 Globalisation

Like 'internationalisation', the use of the term 'globalisation' varies as to whether it is normative or descriptive. In addition, there are three other important variations:

- spatial: what it encompasses in the geo-strategic dimension, and how the global dimension relates to the nation-state;
- content: whether it should be understood as fundamentally economic/ technological, or whether it also takes in cultural, political and sociological phenomena, not to mention questions of identity, and subjectivity;
- homogeneity/ difference: whether globalisation is overwhelmingly homogenising in character or it is also (or instead) associated with diversificiation.

On the question of the spatial, 'globalisation' is used variously to refer to either (1) world-wide phenomena, as in 'global warming'; (2) global systems that are distinct from but criss-cross the nation-state; (3) global relationships which encompass all or part of the world, and may incorporate the nation-state to some extent; (4) a strong globalisation which progressively subsumes all other identities and relationships in a new global order.

The neo-liberal discourse mostly adopts position (4). In *Global Transformations* (1999) Held et. al take position (3), defining globalisation in terms of relationships across large and geographically integral parts of the earth's surface - regions or continents at least, if not

more. They distinguish globalisation from relations between two nations, wherever located, as in 'internationalisation'. To them globalisation is:

> A process (or set of processes) which embodies a transformation in the spatial organisation of social relations and transactions - assessed in terms of their extensity, intensity, velocity and impact - generating transcontinental or interregional flows and networks of activity, interaction, and the exercise of power.
>
> In this context, flows refers to the movements of physical artefacts, people, symbols, tokens and information across space and time, while networks refer to regularised and patterned interactions between independent agents, nodes of activity, or sites of power (Held et al 1999, 16).

On the question of the phenomena recognised under the heading 'globalisation' - which is also the question of which academic disciplines are used to interpret the materiality of global relations - many theorists treat it as primarily or entirely an economic/ technological or political-economic phenomenon. This is overwhelmingly true of the neo-liberal interpretation of globalisation, but is also true of some of those who argue against a strong notion of globalisation (for example Hirst and Thompson 1996) or otherwise disagree with the neo-liberal position (for example Boyer and Drache 1996). On the other hand there is a smaller but significant body of work which defines 'globalisation' in terms of cultures and identities (for example Babha 1990). Harvey (1990) brilliantly links political economy and cultural forms in his account of time-space compression. Appadurai (1996) - even more far-reaching in imagination if not as polished in analysis - takes in all of the identified dimensions in his account of global flows. Held et al (1999) are also broad in their reach, though their analysis is predominantly concerned with economic, political and demographic aspects. They discuss cultural aspects such as media in terms of the political economy of cultural institutions, they tend to downplay technologies, and do not enter the terrain of subjectivities at all, thus missing the points made by Appadurai and others about the salience on technologies in the formation of new identities.

While some neo-liberal accounts explain globalisation as the triumph of economic markets over polities thereby excluding the state in terms of both the reality and its interpretation (classically Fukuyama 1989), many other theorists define and discuss 'globalisation' in terms of relations of power, hegemonies, hierarchies and inequalities.

Most of those who discuss power bring nation-state politics into the picture, albeit a nation-state increasingly subject to global effects.

The understanding of 'globalisation' as a largely or entirely homogensing force is well represented on both the 'pro' and 'anti' sides. At the same time there is a significant body of work which draws attention to the manner in which global communications and means of identity-formation, more transparent and more 'porous' national borders, and the formation of more culturally mixed national and global communities, enable a greater element of complexity and heterogeneity. They bring us into contact with more 'others' and more 'difference', even while, and ironically, the distance between self and other is being diminished (Mollis 1993). Indeed, global forces enable new kinds of identity to emerge. In these understandings of 'globalisation', the balance between homogenisation and heterogenisation is not fixed or law-like: it varies according to context, location, time, relations of power, etc. For example it varies according to the location of the community or site within the global order (thus the more vulnerable a nation, or a group within a nation, the more likely it will be steam-rolled by global culture and economy). Appadurai (1996) emphasises heterogeneity and the formation of hybrid and cosmopolitan identities, and Held et al (1999) attempt to leave open a good deal of scope for contingency.

This more subtle and complex approach creates the potential for a more complex politics of globalisation. It moves beyond the dualistic choice between wholistic advocacy of globalisation and wholistic denial. It enables recognition of both 'desirable' global forms and 'undesirable' global forms, depending on one's standpoint. Thus from the social democratic viewpoint globalisation can exacerbate global inequalities by enabling the more unequal distribution of private goods sanctified by global agencies such as the World Bank. On the other hand, global agencies such as aid-based NGOs might produce public goods, as might global solidarity networks in relation to human rights.

The best known example of a highly normative approach to the term 'globalisation' is the neo-liberal. This selectively appropriates parts of the empirical description of tendencies to globalisation, to build the discourse of inevitable and utopian movement towards a single world, defined as a world market. For the neo-liberal, the perfectly competitive world market is a utopia, the discursive horizon, the ultimate objective of policy and regulation (Marginson 1997). Thus the neo-liberal account mostly assumes a spatially strong version

of globalisation, sees it in terms of homogenisation, and mostly discusses it in terms of economics and markets. This is 'globalism'. It has its critics. Some react to it in terms of simple opposition, juxtopposing against homogenous neo-liberal globalism, an equally homogenous refusal - for example by asserting a traditionally monocultural and closed nation-state: the far right-wing reaction to 'globalisation' takes this form. Others argue against it because of what it tends to exclude or suppress. The neo-liberal norm, unlike that of its opponents, has the opportunity to be implemented as practice, and we can draw up a balance sheet of the real effects. Bourdieu (1999) describes neo-liberal globalism thus:

> It is a myth in the strong sense of the word, a powerful discourse, an *idee force*, an idea which has social force, which obtains belief. It is the main weapon in the battles against the gains of the welfare state (Bourdieu 1999).

Further pursuing this theme of the ideological character of neo-liberal 'globalisation', Bourdieu and Wacquant (1999) argue that we are experiencing the worldwide spread of a new global vulgate resulting from the false and uncontrolled universalisation of the folk concepts and preoccupations of American society and academe. In this process the particular historical experience of one society becomes transformed into tools of analysis and yardsticks for policy, and thus tacitly instituted as a model for humanity.

3. Interview responses on 'internationalisation' and 'globalisation'

During the interviews, th majority of respondents were unable, or unwilling, to provide coherent definitions of 'internationalisation' and globalisation', and failed to distinguish between them. 'I think to a great extent they go hand in hand... obviously they're linked, I feel, you know...' was typical of many responses. One executive manager-leader stated:

> I don't like the words. And I don' use them very often, either globalisation or internationalisation, partly because they are very foggy - well, they can be very foggy concepts. People can be talking about them and suddenly realise that they are talking about different things.
>
> Executive leader-manager, University of Canberra

When asked to define the terms, a number of respondents responded in programmatic terms, that is, by saying what their university was currently doing, or not doing:

> Most of my staff now do their teaching abroad. We teach in Thailand, Vietnam, Malaysia. We're doing a fair bit of off-shore teaching. I'll never set up a campus. I think that's great for the people who have got the money, but we're not going to do that. Also we found it very difficult to repatriate money from China and Vietnam. Our focus is on partnerships with other universities. We get a lot of staff from other universities doing Masters degrees here and taking home our curriculum.
>
> Executive leader-manager, University of Canberra

> We've just signed an agreement with the advertising industry in Malaysia to allow, initially it's only four students, to spend time as part of their course here in the Malaysian advertising industry... In terms of research, we have a Centre for Research in International Communication. As part of that Centre we are involved in an international news flow project which looks at the global flow of news in 40 countries. It's coordinated by one person in the US, one in Britain and we're doing the Australian component of that. It's a major topic and conference, it's like the international association for media and communication research, which is a major international body which has affiliations to UNESCO.
>
> Academic manager-leader, University of Canberra

However, a large minority of respondents did engage with the definitional problem. A few provided clear-cut and coherent (albeit varying) distinctions between the terms.

3.1 Internationalisation

There were two main approaches to 'internationalisation'. One group saw it simply as the development of 'international education', as that term is mostly used, meaning the global market in teaching services The second approach was to use 'internationalisation' as a 'catch-all' concept, containing all of the institution's activities which were recognisably international in character. This usage was sometimes joined to the marketing aspect:

> Internationalisation: I think it means, at least for this university, reaching out to other countries trying to recruit students. I think we focus predominantly on recruiting students. But it means a bit more than that. We're also looking for research opportunities, partnerships with other universities, consultancies, helping other universities mature and grow, in other countries.
>
> Middle level academic leader-manager, University of Canberra

Often, the broader definition of 'internationalism' was explicitly contrasted with a narrower economism. This discursive move was especially apparent at the Australian National University, where collegial values remain strong, international marketing is subdued, and the values permeating discussion of international education are the least commercial of the three universities included in this paper:

> Oh no, I don't understand that as internationalisation. Selling more places to international students is just international marketing. And ... I'm not even sure that you necessarily, in all cases, improve your international marketing outcomes by internationalising your courses.
>
> Senior Manager, Australian National University

Most respondents who did focus on 'internationalisation' did so in terms of international exchange, a mildly enthusiastic awareness of the other, and the assumption that encounters with difference were pedagogically valuable, and maturing for students. There was much more willingness to use 'internationalisation' in this often very positive manner, than to use the term 'globalisation' in any manner. This use of 'internationalisation' also plays a significant role in all three universities' documents:

> Internationalisation is informing our curriculum, it is also providing an experience to our own students to open their horizons.
>
> Senior Manager, Australian National University

> I would say that is internationalisation, to get people together ... learn about other people's cultures, mix and mingle. Basically just learn about people other than from their own culture, which is quite a big problem in this university.
>
> Student, University of Canberra

> Internationalisation for me is building links with the international community, not only outgoing links, but also from my own interests, internationalising the experience of students here. And then creating an academic environment where the fact that Australia is so far away from other countries, is not necessarily a disadvantage, that you can in fact create links.
>
> International office, Australian National University

> For me internationalisation is getting people to relate to each other beyond national boundaries and beyond cultural borders... Internationalisation is a process of cultural adjustment ... It's about generating a sympathetic understanding between human beings. That's my bottom line... that's why I'm interested in language teaching.

Academic, University of Canberra

'Internationalisation' involved change in the university, but for most people, it did not constitute the same sense of transformation-as-threat as did globalisation. Respondents seemed to feel that 'internationalisation' could be encompassed by broadening existing educational practices, rather than replacing them. However, several people used 'internationalisation' in a somewhat different manner, to refer to the need for whole-institution rather than piece-meal approaches.

> We need to work strategically to build a network of influence. Some of our academics are regarded as among the best in the world in their own particular disciplines and they talk to academics in their particular discipline in institutions overseas but that doesn't flow on to a complete institution-to-institution basis. That's something we have to learn to work with.
>
> Senior Manager, Australian National University

Using 'internationalisation' in connection with whole-institution strategies took the term into deeper waters. For example, in many Australian institutions 'internationalising' the curriculum refers to a centrally-driven process of changing courses to accommodate international students more effectively. There is no consensus on what this might mean, but it is already contested:

> Changing the nature of the way we do things to include people from other cultures ... it means that the courses we mount do not make presumptions about a body of knowledge in terms of our institutions, and our procedures, and our cultural norms, and so on.
>
> Senior Manager, Australian National University

> In some ways most of the students who come here are coming because it's Australian or Anglo-Saxon. It's the dominant language and economic group in the world, isn't it? Students who come to study with us are participating in that. Changing the curriculum too much would in fact defeat some of the purposes of those students studying here.
>
> Middle level academic manager-leader, University of Wollongong

3.2 Globalisation

The minority that used 'globalisation' did do in one of two ways. The larger group discussed it in the neo-liberal sense, in terms of the global economy, and universities as competitive

and commercial institutions in that economy. The smaller group referred to communications, especially the formation of electronic community, and travel.

The economic sense of globalisation was clearly a positive influence in the structuring of a number of people's thinking, especially those with managerial responsibilities in international relation to education programs. For example:

> I think that a strategic priority is that with globalisation, the competition for education and education services will be one that will be opened up to all kinds of providers. It's already happening. For example, Arthur Anderson, Anderson Legal, Anderson Consulting already is marshalling its huge databases to offer all kinds of training and courses which will be in direct competition with what we do. Already law firms are buying up accounting firms, accounting firms are buying up law firms. No doubt Gates, IBM and others will be there, so as I see it, our strategy is in a way two fold. One is within that huge competition, to find particular niche markets in which we will be able to survive. The other is to make ourselves as attractive a partner as possible, so that where we can, we will cooperate with others to provide some expertise. Particularly with Australian or regional type content.
>
> Middle level academic manager/ leader, University of Canberra

> There are developments in the US where you have a university that does not have a geographical home at all, which is perceived in terms of an institution which will create on-line courses, contact with particular providers to work with students on those courses. It's opening up a different model of global institution.
>
> Middle level academic manager-leader, Australian National University

One interviewee commented that the 'hard' economic image conjured up by globalisation gave the term credibility, compared to internationalisation which was often 'one of those fuzzy words everyone feels good about'. Nevertheless, as noted, 'globalisation' provoked negative responses, with several respondents emphasising that they, personally, did not use the term. It was criticised for its economic determinism, for its mono-cultural character, and for the emphasis on competition at the expense of cooperation.

> I generally don't accept the term globalisation.... I don't like the inevitability or the suggestion that market processes dominate and are beyond regulation.
>
> Senior manager-leader, University of Wollongong

> Internationalisation is about sharing. Globalisation brings in a more competitive thing, where you are looking at survival. There is a tension between the two.... If you are in competition then some of that sharing is under threat.
>
> Academic, Australian National University

Several respondents were sceptical about official university rhetoric, and government rhetoric, that referred to a broad conception of international education.

> There is not some huge desire to explore new Asian cultures, but a purely market-based rationale... there is a market to be tapped and Australia sees itself as having the leverage to tap it. I don't think it is any more than that. I'd like to think it is more noble than that, but I don't believe it.
>
> Postgraduate student, Australian National University

This neo-liberal notion of 'globalisation' was associated with a sense of homogenisation. Unlike 'internationalisation', where most people sensed that self-determination was possible, this kind of 'globalisation' was seen always as something done *to* us, never as something done *by* us:

> Globalisation implies universal mutually accepted standards, developed to the American idea of what everything should be and to a position which the US are comfortable with. Normally for the advantage of the US, not necessarily for anybody else's advantage. It is carried mainly through communications technologies - whether it is an information stream or financial stream. So it is the spread of Western, that is American-dominated mass culture [using] a set of intrusive standards, which are ill defined, but which the US seems to expect others to accept. Whether it is in education or health or environment or finance or politics or social structures.
>
> Academic, University of Canberra

On the other hand, discussion of 'globalisation' as transport and communications was more benign:

> [Globalisation, as well as referring to an interdependent economy and polity] is also characterised by an interdependent world, a world with modern technology, where people can get in contact with each other, so there is a more Marshall McCluhan sense of the global village... the way globalisation is interpreted varies greatly depending on cultures, context, etc.
>
> Middle level academic manager/ leader, University of Canberra

> [Globalisation conveys to me] people from universities criss-crossing all over the globe. Nobody seems to have their act together and everyone going off willy nilly across the world. Globalisation is out there. Yeah.
>
> International Office, University of Canberra

> When people say globalisation, basically they mean technology.... I can see one day when not so many students actually come here, and we teach some of our courses via the Internet and video-conferencing.
>
> Academic, Australian National University

> The most obvious symbol of the change [to globalisation] now is the world-wide web - the effect that's having in changing our orientations, and our relationships and interactions, in the way it effects our work. We can as readily look at the way in which the Scottish Higher Education Funding Council goes about it, or gives advice to universities on resource allocation issues, which is something we are grappling with in the Faculties.
>
> Senior Manager, Australian National University

3.3 Distinguishing 'internationalisation' and 'globalisation'

In stating the difference between the two terms, one middle level manager-leader saw internationalisation as homogenising, and globalisation as a global strategy with local variation. He referred to a group of business programs provided by an Australian university on a partnership basis, with a local provider in Britain, India, Australia and the US. There was a single award, but the legal studies component of the program was fundamentally different in each location. It was impossible to develop one legal subject that would be appropriate for all students in all four countries - though this was what 'internationalising' a course or subject normally meant. This meant that the development of this postgraduate program was an example of 'globalisation' rather than 'internationalisation'. This approach was coherent, and insightful in relation to global business strategies, but it was not shared by anyone else.

Two respondents saw 'internationalisation' as a stage along the road to a fuller 'globalisation', in a move from continued separation (national) to full integration (global).

However, the clearest statement of distinction between the two was drawn by respondents who contrasted the neo-liberal norm of 'globalisation' with a humanist, education-centred norm of 'internationalisation'.

> Internationalisation is another question altogether [from globalisation]. It has to do with the education of our students, so they have the capacity and some of the skills to look outside their immediate environment ... and engage with cultures other than their own.... It's not commercial, it doesn't have to do with globalisation of the world in an economic sense. It has to do with the need for Australia to be increasingly less

> parochial and have the capacity to engage with other cultures, particularly [in the] Asia-Pacific.
>
> Academic, University of Wollongong

> I prefer the term 'internationalisation' myself... I suspect because 'globalisation' has been seen so much in terms of economic relationships, but I would want to separate out the negative vibes that globalisation gives to a lot of people...
>
> International Office, Australian National University

> The internationalisation of education, if that is handled well and at optimal excellence, will be a very powerful means of correcting the excesses of globalisation. [It] creates the opportunity for the young to see for themselves and to be able to appreciate non multicultural, non mass US culture or the culture of what might be the minority people of the world and even to be able to eventually state a position of protecting those values in other societies. Values which might be quite different to those which are involved in globalisation.
>
> Academic, University of Canberra

4. Conclusions

The last quote summarises sharply, the somewhat more blurred thinking of a number of other respondents. To the extent that interviewees had an opinion about the two definitions, their notions of 'globalisation' were strongly influenced by the normative neo-liberal version ('globalism'); while the use of 'internationalisation' has been shaped by a contrasting norm, a kind of educational 'internationalism' that is grounded in humanist and democratic precepts about sharing and openness to cultural difference. (Despite this, there was little discussion of what difference or otherness actually means in the university context).

Nevertheless this finding about contrasting norms should not be overstated. The perception of globalisation as neo-liberal economics is widely held; but clear-cut notions of internationalisation are not as widely held, even among staff working in international education, and students who are themselves international students. Further, for some respondents, 'internationalisation' is merely about the market in international education.

The data from the interviews also suggest the perhaps unsurprising point that only very limited aspects of the theoretical debate about 'globalisation' find their way to people not professionally involved in those debates. In contrast with theorists, few of the respondents had developed clear spatially-based definitions of 'globalisation'. Only a handful contrasted

the 'global' as supra-national with the 'international' as relations between nations. Most had not grasped the debate about the future of the nation-state, although some middle and senior manager-leaders referred to the argument that the trend to the global had the potential to undermine or by-pass national government. On the other hand, there is some awareness of the tension between economic and other approaches to understanding the global (though little clarity about the alternatives to an economic approach); and related to this, there is some use of the notion of globalisation as processes of homogenisation.

Further case studies are needed, to subject the three hyoptheses outlined above to the full test across the different types of university. However, so far so good: the data presented here are consistent with all three hypotheses. In the universities concerned, 'globalisation' is untheorised. There is no coherent understanding or empirically-grounded practice of the link between globalisation and international education. International education is a heterogeneity of sometimes contradictory practices. It appears that there are tensions between international education as commercial services, and international education as (1) pedagogical/ pastoral practices, and (2) exchange and collaboration, though these tensions need further exploration.

Finally, the apparent triumph of the neo-liberal conception of globalisation at the popular level - even in the universities, the one place where a detailed critique is available - raises doubts about discursive-political strategies of either trying to pluralise the term 'globalisation', or setting out to wholly transform neo-liberal economic globalisation into a cultural globalisation grounded in an ethic of valuing the other. For us, the question at issue is not the values inherent in these strategies, but whether the terms 'global' and 'globalisation' can bear the weight of the strategies.

It may be that the sheer weight of neo-liberal discourse, not so much in the universities (though it is strong in Economics and Business Studies) as in the mass media, government and the corporate world, may mean 'globalisation' is irretrievably lost to such sensitive usages as Appadurai and others persuade us. If so, we should not jettison the insights of the cultural school, and the power of its critique of neo-liberal economism. If 'globalisation' is too far gone, we will need to develop another world-level term, if we are to secure and popularise a broader understanding of global phenomena than neo-liberalism permits.

References

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at Large: Cultural dimensions of globalisation.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Babha, H. (1990). *Nation and Narration.* London: Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (1999). *Acts of Resistance: Against the tyranny of the market.* [tba]

Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L. (1999). 'On the cunningof imperial reasons'. *Theory Culture and Society*, 16(1), pp. 41-[tba].

Boyer, R. and Drache, D. (1996). *States against Markets: The limits of globalisation* London: Routledge.

Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs, DETYA (1999). *Higher Education Statistics,* various publications. Canberra: DETYA.

Fukuyama, F. (1989). 'The end of history?' *National Interest*, 16.

Harvey, D. (1990). *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Held, D, McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D. and Perraton, J. (1999). *Global transformations*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Hirst, P. and Thomson, G. (1996). *Globalisation in question*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Marginson, S. (1997). *Markets in Education.* Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Marginson, S. (1999). 'Diversity and convergence in Australian higher education', *Australian Universities Review* 42(1), 12-23.

Marginson, S. (2000). *Monash: The remaking of the university*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Marginson, S. and Considine, M. (2000). *The Enterprise University: Governance and reinvention in Australian higher education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mollis, M. (1993). *The use of comparison in educational science*, unpublished paper. Buenos Aires: Universidad de Buenos Aires, Educacion Superior Comparada.

Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, OECD [text on international education tba]

Slaughter, S. and Leslie, L. (1997). *Academic Capitalism*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Waterman, P. (1993). Internationalism is dead: long live global solidarity', in J. Brecher, J. Childs and J. Cutler, *Global Visions: Beyod the new world order*. London: Black Rose Books, pp. 247-263.